6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Familycentrism, family isolation, and lack of trust in one's neighbor were apparently projected into the supernatural world where one's own Domovoy, though at times arbitrary, ill-tempered and spiteful, was generally considered to be benevolent—bringing good luck to the household which was under his care and solicitude. The neighbor's Domovoy, on the other hand, was always a malevolent and wicked being who could never be propitiated and who was likely to steal your hay or drive away your cattle for the benefit of the home which was under his protection. The Russian peasants, therefore, developed means of defense against the neighbor's Domovoy in the form of spells and exorcisms.

Lack of social trust is not favorable to the development of solidarity within a community. Therefore lack of group identification among the peasants and burghers, the same as the lack of the *esprit de corps* among the nobility, contributed to the perpetuation of the autocratic rule. Lack of communal identifications was an obstacle to the turning of group hostilities against the ruling classes. In such circumstances a great deal of personal aggressiveness had to find outlets and targets within the local community and within the family circle itself. Only when the authorities suffered crushing defeat and loss of prestige the hostilities would turn against them and mass uprisings would take place, demanding re-establishment of old communal values.

With the ascendancy of the otsovskaya system, family relations came to be organized in a hierarchical system along the lines of paternity, marriage status, seniority and sex. At one time, only married male members formed the family council (soviet). The males had priority over the females. Within each sex category the elder had priority rights over the younger. When the family was partitioned, custom demanded that the older brothers leave the ancestral home while the youngest, following Mongol traditions, remained on the paternal *koren* (root).[4] In marrying the daughters it was the eldest who had to be married first.

In the patriarchal family, in their relations to the father, all family members were expected to accept his rule with fear and awe (*strakh*) and with humility (*smirenie*). They had to show absolute submission and blind obedience (*besprekoslovnoe povinovenie*),[5] as well as love and gratitude (*blagodarnost*).[6]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

These attitudes implied complete dependency and self-abnegation on the part of the wife and children in relation to their master. The wife and the children were expected always to speak with respect to the father, that is, in the second person plural instead of the second person singular—the way the children addressed each other or their mother. The wife did not address her husband by his first name, but by his first and second name (patronymic) which was the way less intimate acquaintances addressed each other. The children had to demonstrate their thankfulness for the father's care and solicitude by kissing his hands. Before a bride left her parental home, custom demanded that she say to her father, "God will help you for bread and salt." And he would advise her to be obedient to her new relations: "Be obedient to them the way you were obedient to me" (*slushay kak menia slushala*).[7]

Emphasis on fear and awe, obedience and gratitude was very outstanding in the Great-Russian patriarchal family relations. These feelings and attitudes had a supernatural sanction. As a result of the teachings of the Russian Orthodox Church, it was considered in popular opinion that any disobedience or disrespect of the father's will was mercilessly punished by God who brought life-long misery and misfortune for such unfilial behavior. Even after death, the soul of a disobedient and ungrateful child could hardly escape punishment in the eternal fire of hell. Many Great-Russian folktales place a great emphasis on obedience and gratitude and stress the cruel penalty and fearful fate that awaited a disobedient and ungrateful son.[8]

Such family relations in which demands of a harsh and detached, and even capricious and arbitrary father had to be answered by humility, unconditional submission, blind obedience, love and gratitude; in which family members fought over priorities and rights; where all felt dependent upon one another and isolated from the rest of the world, could not fail to provoke tensions and cause intense family antagonisms and animosities. Such tensions and conflicts became characteristic of the Great-Russian patriarchal family and were manifested in the relations between husband and wife, father and sons, between the siblings and between the in-laws.[9]

G. Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

desire for his father's death.[17] Only then was there hope for freedom. A folk maxim, for instance, says: "When the earth takes the parents, the children get their freedom." Such an extreme form of revolt, however, was not so simple because it went counter to the accepted image of the father, his supernaturally sanctioned absolute power, his care and solicitude for the welfare of all the family, and the traditional obligation of love and gratitude towards him on the part of the family members. Hence antagonistic attitudes against the father were regularly mixed with strong feelings of guilt.

Both the feeling of guilt and the fear of being rejected by the father might have perhaps been manifested in those folk tales which tell gruesome and frightful stories about children who were abandoned by their parents[18] and left at the mercy of wild beasts, frost, open sea, and in those folk tales in which the children are dismembered by their own parents and thrown away in small pieces. That the father himself sensed a potential feeling of rebelliousness on the part of his son and that he himself might have had a feeling of guilt because of his treatment of his son is witnessed by folk sayings which express a dread of old age with its dependency upon one's own children: "To pay old debts and to feed old parents are the hardest things in the world"; "One father will feed nine children sooner than nine children will feed one father"; "God take away my life rather than let me be under my son's care."[19]

There were other tensions and conflicting situations in the Great-Russian patriarchal family, particularly in the urban strata. The principle of seniority, for instance, reserved disciplinary privileges and responsibilities for the brothers in relation to their sisters, and for the senior brothers and sisters in relation to their juniors. At the same time a father's absolute power often took the form of favoritism in respect to a younger son, or to a daughter, which was counter to the established principles of seniority and therefore considered unjust. There was therefore plenty of opportunity for resentments, rivalries, jealousies, hatreds, and fights among the siblings, or between the older and the younger family members:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

The family was divided into two clans, the elder and the younger. The elder ones were proud, rich, all powerful, fearing none but Jupiter [father]. They had fine rooms where they could run about and play without fear of colliding with the furniture; they lived in style and despised us, and punished us. The youngsters were weak and oppressed, with only a little room as their domain; they were kept running errands and had sweets to eat only on the rare occasion when they were given a few. They were teased and were accused of lying when they were not telling lies; . . . They had none to defend them against the iniquity of the elders . . . The two clans carried on constant warfare. The elders . . . would treat the youngsters as vassals and make fun of them.[20]

In the homes of merchants and petty officials, frictions, tensions, and animosities were so outstanding a feature of family life as late as the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, that they formed a recurrent theme in Russian belles-lettres of those days, such as in the works of Dostoyevsky and of Ostrovsky. N. Dobrolyubov, a noted Russian critic, commenting on the writings of Ostrovsky, asserted that it was the system of tyranny which caused cunning, hatred, lack of justice and of human dignity in the family.[21] In a similar way Peter Kropotkin, observing family relations in various strata of Russian society in the second part of the nineteenth century, claimed that, "quite a network of habits and customs of domestic slavery, of utter disregard of human individuality, of despotism on the part of the fathers, and of hypocritical submission on that of the wives, the sons, and the daughters, had developed."[22]

9
MOTHER-CHILD ATTACHMENT

I

THOUGH the internal situation in the Great-Russian patriarchal family tended to be rather tense, the role played by the mother was likely to introduce into that family an element of moderation and emotional integration.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ness and ruthlessness both toward themselves and toward those who were not with them became in this manner an integral part of the revolutionary movement in Russia.[15] On such foundations a "science of merciless destruction" was developed:

> The revolutionary is wholly dedicated. He must show no mercy to the State or towards the civilized classes of society; nor does he ask for mercy for himself. Between him and society there is waged a mortal war declared or concealed, a relentless and irreconcilable fight to the death. He must accustom himself to torture.
>
> Tyrannical towards himself, the revolutionary must be tyrannical towards others. All the emotions that move human beings, all the soft and enervating feelings of kinship, love, friendship, gratitude and honor, must give way to a cold and single-minded passion for revolution. For him there exists only one pleasure, one consolation, one reward, one satisfaction—the success of the revolution. Night and day he must have but one thought, but one aim—merciless destruction. Coldly, relentlessly, he pursues his aim, and he must be prepared to perish himself, as he must be prepared to destroy with his own hands those who stand in his way.[16]

A revolutionary organization engaged in a life and death struggle with the rest of society precluded any internal disagreement. Bakunin, for instance, conceived a secret organization with a disciplined membership, a system of strict control of its members, and a rigidly centralized authority vested in one man only. Bakunin's secret society was to consist of three separate and independent groups which would function under different names and would be unacquainted with one another. Each one of these three groups was to operate in a different stratum of society. But each group was to be subject to a rigid hierarchy of power and each member of the group subjected to unconditional obedience to his superiors.

These secret societies were to be limited to a small number of people and were to include, as far as possible, only able, experienced, energetic, and influential men, professional conspirators, who, in strict obedience to a central control would lead the masses. All three secret societies were to be coordinated by a central committee which would have consisted of Bakunin and of three or four other members selected by him. Bakunin wanted

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of strata, whose interests were often conflicting. There were the *obshchiniki* (the communal landholders), the *otrubniki* (the peasant private property owners), the *khutoriane* (isolated homestead owners), the *bednyaki* (the poor and indebted peasants), the *serednyaki* (the middle peasants), and the *kulaki*. Finally, there were still the pomeshchiki who owned manorial estates with arable lands, timber-forests and pasture grounds. These were, however, gradually selling their land to the better-off peasants.

The peasant private landholders prospered better than those in the communes. The yield per acre on communal lands has always been much lower than on the private lands. The communal landholders had to rely for a part of their income on wages. These they got as seasonal industrial workers or as agricultural laborers on the lands of the landed gentry. They also worked on the lands of better-off individual peasant property owners whom they resented and called *"novye pomeshchiki"* (the new squires). The poor, landless, and indebted peasants antagonized the better-off peasants. The lower and the middle peasants resented the kulaks and the pomeshchiki.

At the same time the individualization of the Great-Russian peasantry was proceeding very slowly in spite of government help and encouragement. By 1912 the proportion of consolidated peasant holdings, as compared to those remaining in the communal system, was less than 11 percent. Between 1907 and 1915 only about 20 percent of the peasants left land commune.[16] This slow decommunalization did not, however, indicate lack of desire for private land ownership. The reasons for the persistence of the old communal land system lay in the shortage of land, in peasant poverty, in vested interests within the village commune, and finally in traditional lack of self-reliance among the peasants.

As long as a large part of the Great-Russian peasantry remained in the system of communal landholding where lack of initiative and primitive techniques of cultivation prevailed, no great general improvement in land cultivation and in the standard of living of the peasantry could have been expected in spite of all government efforts. Thus, economically insecure and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of foreign loans and investments the process of industrialization and of economic autarchy, which was needed to develop military potential necessary to withstand internal and external threats, was proceeding at too slow a pace. This situation made it imperative for the impatient and insecure ruling class to have at hand goods available for quick export in order to buy foreign machinery and to industrialize and militarize the country at a higher speed.

The peasants in the meantime were busy in making improvements on their possessions and in raising the amount of food for home consumption. Increased peasant consumption of food however meant decrease of the crops available both for export and for the needs of fast growing urban strata which were being created as a result of a speedy industrialization. Also lack of regulation of agricultural production meant that planting and sowing were designed to a large extent to satisfy the home needs of the peasant, and only to a lesser extent those of the national or foreign market.

This meant that as long as a large section of the peasantry remained as independent producers there was always a danger that the ruling class might not have at its disposal sufficient quantities of marketable products. And the more the ruling faction felt insecure in its power, the more this potential threat of an economically independent peasantry seemed real and close. This feeling of insecurity and mistrust of the Bolsheviks was manifested in their hatred of the peasantry. "The peasant who has two cows is already an enemy," they would say. Hence the Party hierarchy made the decision not only to abolish the economic independence of the peasants, but also to "destroy peasantry as a class" by means of collectivization.

In their determination to "destroy peasantry as a class," the Bolsheviks first incited the poor and the medium peasants against the "kulaks" and then the landless against the small peasant owners. The Bolshevik agitators took advantage also of the traditional tensions within peasant families and aroused son against father and brother against brother. Thus inciting and exploiting resentments and hostilities between various peasant strata and taking advantage of family antagonisms, the Bolsheviks were able

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

to force the peasants to join the collectives and the state farms. Those who opposed such policies were resettled or banished to convict labor camps. Many were massacred. According to Stalin ten million peasants became victims of this "class war."[5]

In order to insure their complete control over the farming population, the Bolshevik leaders sent the most trusted Party people from the city to the village to manage the newly formed *kolhozes*. These *novye bary* (new lords), as the peasants called them, installed themselves in the mansions of former estate owners and kept themselves at a considerable distance from the rural population, not unlike the former serf-owners. And not unlike the former gentry the new masters were also bent upon extracting maximum labor from the peasantry with minimum reward.

Under such conditions, the peasants, in the first outbursts of their reaction against this state of abusive submission resorted to outward aggression in the form of traditional uprisings. They burnt their crops and slaughtered their cattle rather than collectivize them. It is estimated that almost two-thirds of the entire livestock and a large part of the crops were destroyed.[6] Such a situation affected even the Ukraine, the "granary of Russia" and greatly contributed to the famine of 1932–33 in which hundreds of thousands of people died of starvation and epidemics. It was by such active rebellion that the peasantry forced the Party into a temporary retreat. The Party had to appease the peasants by giving each peasant household the right to retain in private use a small plot of land, and also in private possession a limited number of livestock. Also, private trade in agricultural products was restored in a limited degree.[7]

These were however only temporary concessions, since the Bolsheviks were determined to completely "industrialize" the peasantry as a means of political and economic control. Following such aims the highest possible degree of specialization in farm operation has been fostered and the members of the same family have been assigned to different, spacially separated activities. In this manner the agricultural brigade instead of the peasant family became the basic unit of agricultural production. For the same reason the highest possible degree of mechanization of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

chooses to consider that the interests of the children have not been safeguarded.[5] In such cases parental rights might be lost for up to five years.[6] According to the Soviet educational philosophy it is expected that the parents will *rear* the children, but that the public organizations under the Party's supervision will instruct and supervise parents in the ways of *Communist upbringing* of children.[7]

The Party considers it to be its duty to arouse antagonism of children against parents when such action is necessary in the interest of the survival of the Soviet regime. As mentioned earlier, planned rift between fathers and sons was, for instance, employed to speed up the process of collectivization. Commissar of Agriculture Jakovlev, speaking before a Party congress on the struggle against the kulaks, stated that "In a number of cases, the children of the kulaks are made to revolt against their parents, and thus the kulak families are divided and the kulaks still more isolated." The Party has also been known to take advantage of family conflicts to encourage the children to spy on their parents and to denounce them to the political police:

> Russian parents had to be very careful of what they said in the presence of their own children, and even of how they disciplined their children. One boy, Pavlik Morosov, was built up as a hero among youth because he had denounced his father who was organizing resistance against the kolhoz. Great propaganda was made about this boy. A book was written about him. Actually he became a hero to most children.[8]

In times of political "purges" there were frequent notices in the Soviet papers in which the children of the parents who were politically persecuted publicly renounced their parents.[9] That was the only way they could escape the vengeance of a regime which had revived the tradition of family hostages and used it as an instrument of political conformity.

The Bolsheviks consider that since "one's way of life is a social matter . . . a matter of national policy,"[10] the Party has the right to interfere even in pre-marital and extra-marital sex relations, as well as in the relations between the spouses. "Young Communist organizations cannot remain neutral when the con-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

welcomed them as liberators in World War II, indicate such possibilities.

III

In studying personality growth in the Soviet society, one should take into account also the differences between the urban and the rural environments and the influences of those environments on interpersonal relations within the family circle. Owing to the very rapid pace of urbanization and low rate of production of consumption goods, most of the families located in the urban areas are exposed to the housing shortage and lack of home privacy. Many of these families live in community apartments in which there is only one room per family and in which a number of unrelated families share a common kitchen and toilet facilities. Family conflicts and tensions tend to be intensified in such circumstances. Lack of privacy, noisiness, and lack of sleep in crowded quarters, together with the lack of sufficient food, long hours of work and unsatisfactory conditions of work increase dissatisfactions and magnify existing family conflicts. An outlet for dissatisfactions is found then in trivial scandals and bickering, in petty squabbles, but also in violent emotional outbursts.[31]

Conditions in rural areas are somewhat different. Though virtually all peasant families live in one or at most two-room cottages, which they often share with a few heads of livestock, yet the rural family does have its own privacy. Most peasant families possess a small lot of land around the cottage, on which they raise some poultry or a pig; some might even own a cow. Though this is all very modest, yet with some labor, after the work for the kolhoz has been done, the peasant family has been able to raise some food on its own property and perhaps to sell it on the open market and then buy some clothing and other bare necessities.[32]

Compared to the situation of the city worker, the peasant, though receiving lower wages for his work, and often going in rags, perhaps does feel relatively more independent. If he is an adult with a family he is much less likely to be pushed around, though he is constantly exhorted by kolhoz officials to work more

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia . RF1

reason or another feel rejected, non-accepted, humiliated, oppressed or ostracized in their own society and who find in these parties an opportunity to vent their accumulated grievances and pent-up hostilities. But they also tend to attract people who for idealistic and humanistic reasons seek Utopias of all-human brotherhood. They attract ambitious and talented intellectuals and semi-educated people who have been thwarted in their professional and political expectations; also intellectuals and semi-intelligentsia with mediocre abilities but strong urges for self-assertion and desire for leadership and domination. They also attract many patriots belonging to oppressed nationalities or races, who have identified themselves with their nation, race or ethnic and cultural minority and seek acceptance of their group in a Communistic millenium. In times of social upheavals these parties attract also many adventurers, criminals, vagabonds, and other deviants and offenders.

It is, however, people overcharged with destructive aggression who in these parties tend to climb toward the top levels of Party leadership, because it is such people to whom the Party offers great opportunities for their destructive urges and who therefore tend to be unconditionally loyal to Moscow as contrasted to the more moderate and more humane and patriotic elements, who for one reason or another might not want always to accept Moscow's dictate. As a result of such internal conditions the history of all Communist parties has been a history of internal intrigues, splits, purges, and frequent bloodshed which in turn made it easier to completely subdue these organizations to the will of the Kremlin:

. . . those who disorganize the Party are to be flayed without mercy. Championing as we do working class unity, we shall with so much more energy and irreconcilability fight for unity within our Parties. There can be no room in our Parties for factions, or for attempts at factionalism. Whoever will try to break up the iron unity of our ranks by any kind of factionalism will get to feel what is meant by the Bolshevik discipline that Lenin and Stalin have always taught us (applause) . . . *The Party is above everything else!* (Loud applause) To guard the Bolshevik unity of the Party as the apple of one's eye is the first and highest law of Bolshevism![88]